

sion should be rejected because it involved deeds too revolting to be credible; I am well aware that no deed was too horrible for the SS. But if the Polish Red Cross doctors, Mackiewicz and others, are to be believed, the condition of the corpses when dug up in April and May 1943 was such as to preclude absolutely the exhumation and reburial alleged to have taken place in March. It seems to me that there is no answer to this evidence unless the Polish witnesses are to be charged with having falsified it, and even then the fact remains that the Germans were willing to have an International Red Cross investigation which would surely have exposed them if they had done what the Russians claim that they did.

With regard to Starobjelsk, Poles from that camp who were sent to Pavlishchev Bor in the spring of 1940 testified that the camp had been completely cleared when their comrades were moved to an unknown destination, and according to the Soviet version the Polish prisoners at the time of the German invasion were no longer in the three original camps, but in camps to the west of Smolensk. It is therefore common ground to both the Soviet and Polish versions that none of the missing officers were in Starobjelsk when the Germans got there, and whatever the SS did there, it could have had no connection with the corpses found at Katyn.

G. F. HUDSON

Oxford, England

A Soviet Decree

TO THE EDITOR OF COMMENTARY:

In order to rescue an innocent bystander from being hurt, I take the liberty of calling the attention of the reviewer of my book *Underground* (in the June number of COMMENTARY) to the fact that the "alleged Soviet decree, issued by Kalinin at the end of 1941, ordering the evacuation of Jews from the path of Germans," did not appear in a "pro-Soviet Yiddish book" but in a most authoritative study on the subject written by Moshe Kaganovich, who is in charge of the Central Historical Commission of the Union of Jewish Partisans in Italy. The quotation in dispute appears on page 188 of his highly praised book, *Participation of Jews in the Partisan Movement of Soviet Russia*, published by the Union of Jewish Partisans in 1948, in Rome, Italy.

Now, while I do not specialize in party labels, I have reason to believe that Moshe Kaganovich is a perfectly kosher Mapainik, and his book, according to the title page, was "edited by the Labor Zionist Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation Inc. in America (673 Broadway, New

York)," which, to my knowledge, no one has ever suspected of pro-Soviet leanings.

DR. JOSEPH TENENBAUM

New York City

TO THE EDITOR OF COMMENTARY:

Dr. Tenenbaum's letter confirms one of the points of my review of his book—his uncritical treatment of some of his source material. For despite Dr. Tenenbaum's facts on the editorial sponsorship of the book, it does suffer from a pro-Soviet bias. Kaganovich cites numerous cases of anti-Semitic acts and attitudes on the part of the Russian partisans. Yet he seems compelled to defend the Soviet Union's official position on anti-Semitism, using vague generalizations to rebut his own evidence. These appear on pp. 146, 160, 178, 187-188, 194, and elsewhere.

The critical reader of Kaganovich's book can distinguish between his facts and his wishful thinking—in which category the supposed Kalinin decree falls—and can separate the valid presentation from the invalid conclusions. Surely, it was not too much to ask this critical judgment also of Dr. Tenenbaum.

LUCY S. DAWIDOWICZ

New York City

The New Immigration Law

TO THE EDITOR OF COMMENTARY:

I very much agree with Oscar Handlin (in the July issue) that the immigration fight has only begun. Equally I agree with him that the fight can be waged successfully only as a frontal attack on the national quotas system itself.

But I am sure that many who read Mr. Handlin's article will be all the more puzzled to understand why the reactionary McCarran bill became law by a vote of Congress overriding the President's veto. He gives entirely too much weight to McCarran's strategic position in Congress as an explanation. He does not give enough weight to two factors: the inadequate preparations of the proponents of the Humphrey-Lehman bill and the extent of the real and latent opposition to liberalization of immigration.

(1) Senators can do many things to arouse wide masses of the public in support of a bill they advocate. They can persuade friendly newspapers to publish series of informational articles well in advance of a vote on the bill. They can organize forces which will send speakers on the issue into thousands of labor union locals, church groups, and fraternal organizations. They can send out millions of mailing pieces under their Congressional franking privileges. They can badger opposing Con-